

REMARKS

Examiner's comments in the Office Action marked "non-final" and dated October 18, 2007 have been read and carefully considered by Applicants. In view of such comments, Applicants have amended the set of claims in the present Application as set forth hereinabove. In particular, all claims 1-20 have been amended so as to better highlight Applicants' proposed invention. In so amending the set of claims, however, Applicants maintain that no new matter has been impermissibly introduced into the present Application. Since no claims have been altogether cancelled and no entirely new claims have been added herein by Applicants, claims 1-20 thus remain pending in Applicants' present Application for Examiner's consideration.

At the present time, it is Applicants' good faith belief that the pending claims, as presented herein, are both novel and non-obvious in view of all known prior art and that the claims properly comply with all applicable statutory requirements. Therefore, Applicants respectfully aver that the pending claims now place the present Application in a condition for allowance and notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Amendments to the Specification:

In the present Amendment, Applicants have amended original paragraphs 0001, 0011-0014, 0029, and 0050 in the written specification of the Application. (See amended paragraphs of the specification as set forth hereinabove.) In general, these paragraphs in the specification have largely been amended so as to merely correct punctuation, grammar, or spelling errors and also help improve overall textual clarity in the Application. Therefore, in making such amendments to the specification, Applicants respectfully maintain that no new matter has been impermissibly added to the present Application.

Objection to the Specification:

In the Office Action, Examiner objected to paragraph 0001 in the specification for not properly referencing (i.e., citing) the application serial number of another United States patent application that is related to the present Application.

In response, Applicants have herein amended paragraph 0001 of the specification so as to properly include the application serial number of the related United States patent application for referencing purposes. (See amended paragraph 0001 of the specification as set forth hereinabove.) In view of amending paragraph 0001 of the specification as such, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner's objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2:

Also, in the Office Action, Examiner rejected dependent claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter that Applicants regard as their invention. In particular, with regard to claim 4, Examiner maintained that there is an insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "at least one external path-tracking sensor" set forth therein.

In response, Applicants have herein amended independent claim 1 by replacing original limitation "at least one tracking sensor" with new limitation "at least one path-tracking sensor," and Applicants have also herein amended dependent claim 4 by replacing original limitation "at least one external path-tracking sensor" with new limitation "at least one path-tracking sensor." (See amended claims 1 and 4 as set forth hereinabove.) In view of amending claims 1 and 4 as such, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner's rejection of claim 4 be withdrawn.

Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Furthermore, in the Office Action, Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered obvious, and therefore unpatentable, by United States Patent Application Publication Number US 2003/0149530, which was published for Lawrence G. Stopczynski on August 7, 2003 (hereinafter "Stopczynski").

In response, Applicants have herein amended all claims 1-20. In particular, Applicants have herein amended independent claims 1, 16, and 19 so as to claim a "path prediction system" or method that uniquely includes or utilizes both a "path-tracking sensor" and a "path-

tracking module," along with a "path prediction module," to predict the future path of a vehicle, on which the sensor(s) and modules are situated, so as to appropriately activate various countermeasures in response thereto. (See amended independent claims 1, 16, and 19 as set forth hereinabove.) Subject matter support for so amending claims 1, 16, and 19 can be found, for example, in specification paragraphs 0009-0011, 0024, 0025, 0029, and 0041-0044 of the Application as originally filed and also in Figures 1 and 2. In view of such, Applicants respectfully maintain that no new matter has been impermissibly added to the present Application.

In brief, Stopczynski teaches a "collision warning and safety countermeasure system" that has vehicle path prediction capability, but such a capability as taught by Stopczynski largely relies on a "sensor fusion" that primarily addresses only sizable objects with which a host vehicle may undesirably collide. (Stopczynski, see especially paragraphs 0024, 0026, 0029, 0047-0049 and also Figure 1.) That is, the vehicle path prediction capability taught by Stopczynski does not include either a "path-tracking sensor" or a "path-tracking module" for detecting and/or tracking a road, a road lane, or a road marking so as to help predict a host vehicle's path for accordingly activating countermeasures, as now claimed and supported by Applicants. (See especially Applicants' claims 1, 4, 16, and 19 as herein amended, and see also specification paragraphs 0024, 0025, 0029, 0041-0044 and Figures 1 and 2 of Applicants' Application as originally filed for subject matter support.)

In view of claims 1-20 as amended hereinabove, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner's claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the specification and claims as amended hereinabove and also the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-20 now properly comply with all statutory requirements for patentability. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner's objections and rejections in the Office Action be withdrawn and that a Notice of Allowance be issued for all claims 1-20.

Also, together with this Amendment, a "Petition for an Extension of Time" is being submitted.

Lastly, should Examiner have any questions with respect to any matter now of record, Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at (248) 433-7200.

Respectfully submitted,

DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC



John A. Artz, Reg. No. 28,824
38525 Woodward Avenue, Suite 2000
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304-5092
telephone: (248) 433-7200
facsimile: (248) 433-7274

Dated: 3/18/2008